

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FIVE

**In re S.K., a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.**

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

S.K.,

Defendant and Appellant.

A136592

**(Alameda County
Super. Ct. No. SJ12018260)**

Appellant S.K. appeals from the juvenile court's September 2012 restitution order. Appellant's counsel has raised no issue on appeal and asks this court for an independent review of the record to determine whether there are any arguable issues. (*Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) Appellant has not filed a supplementary brief. We find no arguable issues and affirm.

BACKGROUND

In January 2012, a Welfare and Institutions Code section 602, subdivision (a) petition was filed in Alameda County Juvenile Court, charging appellant, then 14 years old, with misdemeanor battery (Pen. Code, § 242). According to the police report, the charges were based on an incident during which the victim was attacked and knocked to the ground by a group of other girls, including appellant. Appellant admitted the misdemeanor battery offense and was adjudged a ward of the court and placed on probation.

Following a contested restitution hearing, the juvenile court ordered appellant to pay \$1,166.56 in victim restitution. Appellant appealed from the restitution order.

DISCUSSION

We have reviewed the entire record and have found no arguable appellate issues.

At the September 2012 contested restitution hearing, the victim's mother testified to the economic losses sustained due to the battery. She had previously submitted documentation regarding economic losses due to her time absent from work for court hearings, as well as due to items lost or taken during the incident. A supplemental police report reflected the victim's statement that the items were lost or stolen during the incident, even though she did not see what happened to them.

The juvenile court awarded restitution for the victim's losses due to the victim's mother's time spent testifying that day and the items lost during the incident. The juvenile court did not abuse its discretion. (*People v. Carbajal* (1995) 10 Cal.4th 1114, 1121; *People v. Amin* (2000) 85 Cal.App.4th 58, 63.)

Appellate counsel advised appellant of her right to file a supplementary brief to bring to this court's attention any issue she believed deserved review. (*People v. Kelley* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106.) Appellant did not file a supplementary brief. There are no legal issues that require further briefing.

DISPOSITION

The juvenile court's orders are affirmed.

SIMONS, J.

We concur.

JONES, P.J.

BRUINIERS, J.